

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 were pending. Applicants have amended claims 1-16 and 18-22, cancelled claims 17 and 23, and added claims 24-26. After entry of the amendments, claims 1-16, 18-22, 24-26 will be pending.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite because the term “said network device” lacked sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation. The Examiner stated that “for examining purposes, claim 20 will be read as dependent from claim 19.” Applicants have amended claim 20 to change “network device” to “network interface”, and such that it is dependent from claim 25, and no longer lacks sufficient antecedent basis.

Applicants thus request withdrawal of this rejection as drawn to amended claim 20, and that it be read as dependent from claim 25.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A)

Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16, 18-20, 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganthier (US Patent 6,081,422) in view of Ward (US Patent 6,784,924 B2).

As amended, independent claim 1 recites a network video camera mounting system comprising:

a low profile camera housing defining an opening and comprising an adjustable video sensor assembly, wherein said video sensor assembly receives images through the opening and is adapted for making the received images available through a network interface; and

a mounting assembly attached to the low profile camera housing and adapted for **flush mounting the opening in direct contact with a transparent medium.**

Independent claim 26 recites a network video camera mounting system comprising:

a low profile camera housing comprising an adjustable video sensor assembly and a glare shield, the glare shield circumscribed by an opening on the housing, wherein the video sensor assembly further comprises a network camera lens and an image sensor, and wherein the video sensor assembly receives images through the opening;

a network interface which transmits images from the video sensor assembly; and

a mounting assembly attached to the low profile camera housing and adapted for **flush mounting the glare shield in direct contact with a transparent medium.**

Thus, both of the independent claims include a mounting assembly attached to the low profile camera housing, the mounting assembly adapted for flush mounting the opening (or the glare shield) in direct contact with a transparent medium.

None of the cited references discuss any such flush mounting assembly. Ganthier discusses a monitor which includes a recessed portion for receiving a peripheral device. (Ganthier, Abstract). Ward discusses the generation and use of an automatic configuration file for transmitting images from an electronic still camera. (Ward, Abstract). Neither Ganthier nor Ward make any mention whatsoever of flush mounting the opening or glare shield of a network video camera in direct contact with a transparent medium. As such, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn. For the same reasons, claim 26 should be allowed.

In addition, the combination of the references set forth by the Examiner would not yield the invention. Ganthier discusses the use of a monitor for securely affixing peripheral

devices, while Ward deals with the use of configuration files for transmitting images, in response to user selection, from a still camera. (Ward, col. 3, lines 40-64). The Examiner provided a generalized statement about how the combination would “allow the user to send the image data to different locations such as personal home pages in the World Wide Web, cellular phones, kiosks, etc. without having to connect the camera to a computer to send the image data.” However, in Ganthier, the user is required to connect the camera to a monitor that is inches away from the computer itself. Thus, to send data from the camera in Ganthier, the camera has to be connected to the monitor.

Claims 4, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16, 18-20, 22, and 24-25 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1. All of these dependent claims also include recitations that further define the claimed invention. Based on their dependence on independent claim 1 and other patentable recitations, these dependent claims are also patentable.

Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganthier in view of Ward and Kendrick (US Patent 6,175,300 B1); claim 7 over Ganthier in view of Ward and Novak (US 2002/0141657 A1); claims 10, 12 and 13 over Ganthier in view of Ward and Schnell (US Patent 6,768,868 B1); claims 15 and 17 over Ganthier in view of Ward and Manico (US Patent 5,904,330); and claim 21 over Ganthier in view of Ward and Strandwitz (US 2003/0112335 A1).

At a minimum, these references fail to discuss a mounting assembly attached to the low profile camera housing, the mounting assembly adapted for flush mounting the opening (or the glare shield) in direct contact with a transparent medium. For example, Kendrick discusses a blind spot viewing system, but fails to mention mounting the opening of a camera or glare shield in direct contact with a transparent medium. (Kendrick, Abstract). Novack

describes a system and method for a software steerable web camera, but does not discuss the mounting of the camera. (Novack, Abstract). Schnell discusses a motion detector camera, but fails to address mounting the opening of a camera or glare shield in direct contact with a transparent medium. (Schnell, Abstract). Manico mentions a window camera mount for removably holding a one-time-use camera, but does not disclose a mounting assembly attached to the low profile camera housing adapted for flush mounting the opening (or the glare shield) in direct contact with a transparent medium. (Manico, Abstract). Lastly, Strandwitz discusses a wireless camera system that receives and transmits signals over a radio channel, but does not discuss camera mounting. (Strandwitz, Abstract).

Thus, none of the cited references mentions a mounting assembly attached to the low profile camera housing, the mounting assembly adapted for flush mounting the opening (or the glare shield) in direct contact with a transparent medium.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record and request that the Examiner allow this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
W. PAUL WILLES, ET AL.

Date: June 20, 2007

By: /Brenda M. Simon/

Brenda M. Simon, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 48,449
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7198
Fax: (650) 938-5200
E-Mail: bsimon@fenwick.com